UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,802	04/12/2001	Venugopal P. Reddy	020431.0832	8684

7590   11/16/2005

Christopher W. Kennerly, Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, 6th Floor
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
CHANG, SUNRAY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/834,802	REDDY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sunray Chang	2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  ·after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 September 2005</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 8-19 and 22-28* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

·1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in responsive to the paper filed on September 20th, 2005.

2.   Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 19, and 22 – 28 are presented for examination.

Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 19, and 22 – 28 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.   **Claims 1 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Graham W. Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,128, and referred to as Glass hereinafter).**

Regarding independent claim 1,

Glass teaches,

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1]. [proxy is an object ... can be used to control access to certain objects, Col. 2, Lines 4 – 43]

- Server component [12, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] operable to access data associated with one or more of the server objects [Col. 5, Line 36 – 37].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- In second container [14, Fig. 1], a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are

responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to

the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding dependent claim 2,

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to

   access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

Regarding dependent claim 3,

- Both local and remote client components are operable to access server object data [Col. 6,

   Line 27 – 34].

Regarding dependent claim 4,

- Client component is coded as if it will always be remote from associated server

   components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

- All communications between client component and a server component will be remote

   [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

Regarding dependent claim 5,

- All client components of the server component have been developed using templatized

   code [Col. 6, Line 59 – 61 and 64 – 67].

- Local and remote client-server interface transparency is preserved across all such client

   components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 34].

- Repetitive code generation has been minimized in developing such client components
  [Col. 6, Line 54 – 59].

Dependent claim 6 cancelled.

Dependent claim 7 cancelled.

Regarding dependent claim 8,

- Proxy component performs management tasks to the proxy component [Col. 6, Line 19 –
  20].

Regarding dependent claim 9,

- Proxy component customized by a developer of the server component [Col. 6, Line 17 –
  19].

Regarding dependent claim 10,

- Proxy component and server component cooperate to reconcile proxy object data with
  server object data consistently with local and remote client-server interface transparency
  [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20 and 33 – 34].

Regarding independent claim 11,

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1].

- Server component [18, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] operable to access data associated with one or more of the server objects [Col. 5, Line 36 – 37].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- In second container [14, Fig. 1], a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 12,

- At least one server component [12, Fig. 1] in first container [12, Fig. 1] supporting one or more server objects [18, Fig. 1] having associated data [19, Fig. 1].

- At least one client component [20, Fig. 1], in a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [12, Fig. 1], distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1].

- The client component can access server objects data [Col. 6, Line 14] without been predetermined local or remote [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 13,

- A client component [14, Fig. 1] distributed from the server component [12, Fig. 1] with server object data [19, Fig. 1].

- The client component can access server objects data [Col. 6, Line 14].

- A scheme makes the server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 14,

- There is a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] and a client component [20, Fig. 1] in the first container [14, Fig. 1] remote to second container [12, Fig. 1].

- Second container [12, Fig. 1] containing a server component [18, Fig. 1] supports server objects data [19, Fig. 1].

- The client component is distributed from the server component [Fig. 1].

- A proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- Server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 31 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig..2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 15,

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding dependent claim 16,

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

Regarding dependent claim 17,

- Both local and remote client components are operable to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

Regarding dependent claim 18,

- Client component is coded as if it will always be remote from associated server components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

- All communications between client component and a server component will be remote [Col. 6, Line 30 – 32].

Regarding dependent claim 19,

- All client components of the server component have been developed using templatized code [Col. 6, Line 59 – 61 and 64 – 67].

- Local and remote client-server interface transparency is preserved across all such client components [Col. 6, Line 30 – 34].

- Repetitive code generation has been minimized in developing such client components [Col. 6, Line 54 – 59].

Dependent claim 20 cancelled.

Dependent claim 21 cancelled.

Regarding dependent claim 22,

- Proxy component performs management tasks to the proxy component [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

Regarding dependent claim 23,

- Proxy component customized by a developer of the server component [Col. 6, Line 17 – 19].

Regarding dependent claim 24,

- Proxy component and server component cooperate to reconcile proxy object data with server object data consistently with local and remote client-server interface transparency [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20 and 33 – 34].

Regarding independent claim 25,

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- The scheme allows both local and remote client components to use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 26,

- Local client component directly access the requested server object data when requesting for server object data of a server component [26, 30, Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Remote client component using a proxy component providing local access to proxy object data instead of requested server object data [26, 30, 32 Fig. 2 and Col.6, Line 14].

- Server component [18, Fig. 1] is within a first container [12, Fig. 1].

- Client component [20, Fig. 1] is within a second container [14, Fig. 1] remote from the first container [Fig. 1].

- The proxy component has proxy objects, local copies of server objects [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Both local and remote client components use the same operations to access server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 27,

- A scheme makes the server object substantially transparent to the remote or local client component, while client component accessing remote server object data [Col. 6, Line 27 – 32].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Regarding independent claim 28,

- There is a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] and a client component [20, Fig. 1] in the first container [14, Fig. 1] remote to second container [12, Fig. 1].

- Second container [12, Fig. 1] containing a server component [18, Fig. 1] supports server objects data [19, Fig. 1].

- a proxy component [22, Fig. 1] supports proxy objects to provide a local version of a server object [Col. 6, Line 19 – 20].

- Proxy component provide the client component accessing proxy object data [Col.6, Line 21 – 23] when client requests data from server object [Col.6, Line 14].

- The server objects transparent to both remote and local client component [Col. 6, Line 27 – 34].

- Remote communication data accessing is optimized by client component [26, 30 and 32, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Local communication data accessing is optimized by proxy component [26 and 30, Fig. 2, and Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

- Substantially immediately reflect all changes to data associated with the proxy objects back to data associated with corresponding server objects. [remote proxies in general are responsible for encoding a request and it's arguments and sending the encoded request to the subject object, Col. 6, Lines 24 – 27]

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Applicants' argument regarding "**Glass** does not disclose a server objectr or a server component within a first container,.a server component supporting one or more server objects having associated data" (Page 17) is disagreed with. **Glass** discloses an distributed object management system, a server system and a client system [Fig. 1]. The server system is a container containing only one server component (itself), one subject object [proxy, Col. 2, Lines 4 – 43] and associated data [19; subject class]. [See Col. 5 – Col. 6]

5.   Applicants' argument regarding "**Glass** does not disclose data access operations

optimized for either local or remote communication" (Page 20) is disagreed with. **Glass** discloses

system optimization including reducing requirements, minimize compile and load time, optimize

system performance [Col. 6, Lines 51 – 67].

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3682. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-746-3506.

Sunray Chang
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2121
Technology Center 2100
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600

November 9, 2005